25X1A2g

[redacted]

25X1A2g

[redacted]

18 February 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: SA/AD/CR

SUBJECT : Comments on Rapid Transmittal Proposal

As requested the comments listed below are offered re the subject proposal.

25X1A9a By [redacted]

1. The proposal is to establish a system "which will get substantially all intelligence information to the analyst within 24 hours after the preparation of the report in the field," and in addition:

   a. Maintain a current set of collection requirements and be able to immediately communicate same to collectors.

   b. Maintain a current set of dissemination requirements for each individual analyst in the Agency and be able to change these requirements daily to reflect analysts needs.

   c. Code (index) selected documents for later retrieval but have coding and selection verified by individual analysts primarily concerned with the document.

2. The first part of the proposal for receipt by the analyst of intelligence information within 24 hours is by itself a tremendous assignment. However, when the procedures for automatic feed backs for collection and dissemination requirements are added together with the coding and selection of documents, it would appear to become unduly complicated and defeat the main purpose of aiming for a 24 hour processing time. It is impossible to add steps in a processing system and save time.

3. What must be done to reach the 24 hour deadline is to eliminate all handling steps which are not basically required to get the information to the analyst. These basic requirements are receipt, determine who should get it and get it to him. Most all new systems recommend that coding be done first and dissemination be accomplished based on the codes selected for the document which match the coded requirements of the user. Yet in all these new ysystems it is considered essential to have a "screening out" process so that indexes will not become overloaded. If we screen out documents not to be coded, how can they be disseminated? Please note that of the 7,000 State Department dispatches received each month by OCR over 50% are regularly being selected out and "Nodexed." Yet copies of these "Nodexed" dispatches are disseminated and a percentage of them are considered very important by the recipients. I feel that the

fastest system would have to provide for dissemination without first coding documents. I also feel that it would be impossible for a central panel to disseminate to 5,000 plus analysts in accordance with their individual requirements. It would appear logical for a central panel to disseminate to 150-200 offices based on their requirements and assume that each of these offices would handle the dissemination to the individual analysts.

25X1A2g

4. The test plan for [redacted] reports would require at least 1 Document Division analyst and possibly 3-4 depending on the coverage required by the DD/P; i.e., three shifts a day seven days a week. The Document Division is already working overtime to keep the indexing backlog from building up due to support being furnished to the ADG and we do not see how we can furnish even one analyst for the proposed test.

25X1A9a

By [redacted]

Page 20

Addition of ISC Codes by analysts.

OCR plans to adapt Minicard or some comparable system should be taken into consideration. Assuming that Minicard is the system in use, it is doubtful that the research analyst would want to take the time to fit data (codes and clear text) info phrases to be added to Minicards, secondly the addition of data subsequent to initial minicoding and miniphoting would pose a problem; if plans to associate (or tie together) related phrases concepts within a document materialize, it would mean that each time a research analyst added codes for his particular interest that the document would have to be redone. If the traffic becomes heavy the system would bog down.

25X1A9a

By [redacted]

History of Coding Directly onto Mat

This is not a new idea or operation. From 1953-1956, ISC codes were written directly onto the mats of all OO and CS reports by Analysis Branch coders. The purpose was threefold: (1) to provide Air Force with coded CIA reports which could be converted with Minicode, (2) to acquaint consumers in the intelligence community with the ISC, and (3) to encourage these consumers to suggest additional codes if necessary.

With the exception of a few calls (5-10 at the most in the 3 year period) from OSI/Chemistry & no consumers in CIA or in the community seemed to concern themselves with the codes, even those who were familiar wenough with the ISC. In 1956, the project was discontinued because none of the 3 purposes above were achieved.

Time of Researcher Devoted to Coding

I agree with the statement on p. 20 Paragraph 3. "The better and more widely known the Intelligence Subject Code, the more it is directly used and contributed to by experts in their various fields, the better the retrieval system." However, the particality of the next sentence has not been proven by past history. "Any analyst who receives a copy can take care of his own interests beyond the initial coding by adding appropriate codes." The histroy of coding directly onto CIA mats proved otherwise. Prior to that the project OSI and ORR had and still have the opportunity of coding and abstractin any documents they desire for the intellofax system. OSI and ORR (ORE) began coding operations early in 1949. This stopped completely in 1953 except for OSI/ Chemistry, and ORR/I. OSI/Chemistry stopped in 1955, and shipbuilding and medium machinery branches of ORR/I coded very small portion until early 1958. Researchers are paid to do "research" and not to code. Coding is time consuming in addition to the time required to keep up to date with the ISC. It is too idealistic to hope that the researcher will devote that much time to keep improve the effectiveness of the retrieval program. Page 19, 2nd paragraph states that only those analysts should be asked to use the form whose "feedback" will be with worth exploiting. The 3 types of sepcialists mentioned cover all fields of researchers (except administrators): subject matter specialists, those concerned with writing collection requirements, and those whose work would suffer from poor material retrieval.

Simultaneous Coding and dissemination.

Under present operations coding does not hold up and dissemination for the coding occurs from the processing copy. It is proposed that dissemination could be accomplished by the use of the subject codes (e.g., AFCIN's autostic disseminator) Although this will and does save double reading it does not speed up dissemination for it takes longer to code than it does to disseminate, It is true that one person could code and disseminate 14,000 [redacted] a year (code and disseminate 60 a day or 1200 a month). 25X1A2g

To disseminate to individual analysts, at least 5,000 complete sets of requirements would have to be stored in the new automatic disseminator's memory and for a disseminator to remember all those individual requirements on a current basis (according to the Feedback plan) would be impossible. The Feedbakc plan which visualizes constant changes would also break the back of a machine.